



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
 Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 00/646,484 | 05/05/98 | MOON | B 27951-00023 |

THOMAS L. CRISMAN
 JENKENS AND GILCHRIST
 3200 FOUNTAIN PLACE
 1445 ROSS AVENUE
 DALLAS TX 75202-2799

LM21/0112

EXAMINER
 TILANG, E

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
| 2781 | 7 |

DATE MAILED: 01/12/98

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Advisory ActionApplication No.
08/646,484Applicant(s)
Moon, Billy G.Examiner
Eric S. ThlangGroup Art Unit
2781**THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:** [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☐ expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☐ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on _____ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Oct 16, 1997 has been considered with the following effect, but is **NOT** deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

☒ The proposed amendment(s):

- ☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.

☒ will not be entered because:

- ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
- ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
- ☒ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
- ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: The newly added subject matter in claim 1 of "capable of operating in both full duplex and half duplex mode", which require further search.

- ☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

- ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
- ☐ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

- ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

- ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: _____

Claims objected to: _____

Claims rejected: 11-21

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.
- ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____
- ☐ Other

AYAZ R. SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Response to Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed November 3, 1997 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.97(d) because it lacks a petition requesting consideration of the information disclosure statement. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

EST
January 6, 1998


AYAZ R. SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2700